

## Remarks

### I. Status of claims

Claims 1-38 were pending.

Claims 22 and 31 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 39 and 40 have been added.

Support for the amendments to independent claims 1 and 11 are found on page 16, line 15, through page 18, line 34 of the specification.

### II. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, 12, 15, 17-19, 21-26, and 30-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov (U.S. 6,721,705) in view of Halahmi (U.S. 6,684,088).

#### A. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 21, and 23-26

Claim 1 is an independent claim. Claim 1 has been amended and now recites that “the access module additionally is configured to create a label identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference into the messaging/collaboration data, pass the label to the voice device without passing the data item, and store an association between the label and the messaging/collaboration server reference.”

Neither Kurganov nor Halahmi teaches or suggests the features that have been added to claim 1.

Kurganov does not teach or suggest anything that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify his media servers to pass to the user a label identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference into messaging/collaboration data, as now recited in claim 1. Indeed, Kurganov teaches that the information that is retrieved in response to a user request is converted into an audio message that is transmitted to the user's voice enabled device (see col. 3, lines 47-51 and col. 15, lines 23-38). Passing a label of the type recited in claim 1 to the user would not serve any apparent useful purpose in the context of Kurganov's voice browsing system.

Halahmi also does not teach or suggest anything that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify his e-mail messaging system to pass to the user a label identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference into messaging/collaboration data, as now recited in claim 1. In accordance with Halahmi's teachings, the fetch module 22 sends a list of e-mail messages received from the e-mail server 20 either directly to the user's wireless communication device 12 or to the WAP proxy server 16, which in turn sends the list to the user's wireless communication device 12 (see col. 5, lines 60-67). Thus, in accordance with Halahmi's express teachings, the message identifiers received from the e-mail server 20 are simply passed to the user's wireless communication device 12. Halahmi's system therefore does not create a label identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference into messaging/collaboration data, much less pass such a label to the user's device 12.

Regarding claim 22, the Examiner has stated that:

Concerning claims 22 and 31, Halahmi teaches that an e-mail portion server may send only a list of e-mail messages in response to a "LIST" command, where the received list includes message identification numbers (column 8, lines 1 to 12); each message identification number in a list of e-mail messages is "a reference to a corresponding referenced item," where only a message identification number and header of an e-mail message is passed without passing the e-mail message.

In accordance with Halahmi's teachings, however, the list of message identification numbers that are received from the e-mail server is simply passed to the user's wireless communication device 12 (see col. 5, lines 64-67). Halahmi's system does not create a label identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference into messaging/collaboration data and pass the label to the user's wireless communication device 12, as now recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov and Halahmi now should be withdrawn.

Each of claims 2, 5-9, 21, and 23-26 incorporates the features of independent claim 1 and therefore is patentable over Kurganov and Halahmi for at least the same reasons explained above.

B. Claims 11, 12, 15, 17-19, 30, and 32-35

Claim 11 is an independent claim. Claim 11 has been amended and now recites that “the access module additionally is configured to create a label identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference into the messaging/collaboration data, pass the label to the wireless device without passing the data item, and store an association between the label and the messaging/collaboration server reference.”

The Examiner's rejection of independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of Halahmi now should be withdrawn for the same reasons explained above in connection with claim 1.

Each of claims 12, 15, 17-19, 30, and 32-35 incorporates the features of independent claim 11 and therefore is patentable over Kurganov and Halahmi for at least the same reasons.

C. Claims 3, 4, 13, and 14

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of Halahmi and Trower (U.S. 5,983,190). Claims 3 and 4 incorporate the features of independent claim 1 and claims 13 and 14 incorporate the features of independent claim 11.

The Examiner has indicated that (emphasis added):

Kurganov et al., does not expressly disclose a Component Object Model (COM) to instantiate a server object in response to a request for service. However, Trower, II et al. teaches a client server animation system for speech input and output services of web page scripts using a speech synthesis engine and a speech recognition engine (Column 2, lines 21 to 49). A Component Object Model (COM) generates character animations to obtain general and specific information about a character (Column 17, line 24 to Column 20, line 19). COM interface provides format particularly well-suited to transfer data across process boundaries (Column 18, lines 2 to 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to apply a Common Object Model (COM) to instantiate server objects in response to a request for service as taught by Trower, II et al. in the voice browser system of Kurganov et al. for the

purpose of providing a format particularly well-suited to transfer data across process boundaries.

In this rejection, the Examiner has not addressed the actual language recited in claims 3, 4, 13, and 14. In particular, each of claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 recites that the COM object is invoked in response to a request form completed by the voice or wireless device. The Examiner has not pointed to any disclosure in any of the cited references that teaches or suggests invoking a COM object in response to a request form completed by a device, as recited in claims 3, 4, 13, and 14. Therefore, the Examiner has not established a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to these claims (see MPEP § 706.02(j)).

Moreover, neither Kurganov nor Halahmi nor Trower teaches or suggests anything about responding to a request form completed by a voice device or a wireless device. Therefore, no permissible combination of Kurganov, Halahmi, and Trower possibly could teach or suggest the features recited in claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 in which a voice interface access page is configured to invoke a COM object in response to a request form completed by a voice device or a wireless device.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner's rejection of claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of Halahmi and Trower should be withdrawn.

In addition, Trower does not make-up for the failure of Kurganov and Halahmi to teach or suggest an access module configured to create a label identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference into the messaging/collaboration data, pass the label to the voice device without passing the data item, and store an association between the label and the messaging/collaboration server reference, as recited in independent claims 1 and 11. For this additional reason, the Examiner's rejection of claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of Halahmi and Trower now should be withdrawn.

#### B. Claim 16

The Examiner has rejected claims 16, 27, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of Halahmi and Zarom (U.S. 6,356,529). Claim 27 incorporates the

features of independent claim 1. Claims 16 and 36 incorporate the features of independent claim 11.

The Examiner has cited Zarom for the proposition that "it is advantageous to translate between data transmitted according to the WAP network protocol and HTTP ... so as to enable cellular telephones to receive many types of multimedia data, including e-mail messages and web ..." (citations omitted). Zarom, however, does not make-up for the failure of Kurganov and Halahmi to teach or suggest an access module configured to create a label identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference into the messaging/collaboration data, pass the label to the voice (wireless) device without passing the data item, and store an association between the label and the messaging/collaboration server reference, as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Therefore, claims 16, 27, and 36 are patentable over Kurganov in view of Halahmi and Zarom for at least the same reasons explained above in connection with independent claims 1 and 11.

C. Claims 10 and 20

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kurganov in view of Halahmi and the Workstyle Server White Paper. Claims 10 and 20 incorporate the features of independent claims 1 and 11, respectively.

The Examiner has cited the Workstyle Server White Paper for its teaching of "a server for storing messaging data for wireless devices having an advantage of increasing organizational productivity by giving employees greater command over their information, their communications, and the way they collaborate with colleagues, partners, and customers." The Workstyle Server White Paper, however, does not make-up for the failure of Kurganov and Halahmi to teach or suggest an access module configured to create a label identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference into the messaging/collaboration data, pass the label to the voice (wireless) device without passing the data item, and store an association between the label and the messaging/collaboration server reference, as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Applicant : MAMOUN ABU-SAMAH  
Serial No. : 09/684,065  
Filed : Oct. 6, 2000  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 10005265-1  
Amendment dated Sep. 23, 2005  
Reply to Office action dated July 26, 2005

Therefore, claims 10 and 20 are patentable over Kurganov in view of Halahmi and the Workstyle Server White Paper for at least the same reasons explained above in connection with independent claims 1 and 11.

V. Conclusion

For the reasons explained above, all claims are now in condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Charge any excess fees or apply any credits to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 23, 2005



Edouard Garcia  
Reg. No. 38,461  
Telephone No.: (650) 631-6591

Please direct all correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Department, M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599